DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 771 UD 028 397

AUTHOR Koopman, Roberta; And Others
TITLE Title VII: Bilingual Resource Service Model. Report No. 89-6, June, 1989.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Cambodians; Chinese Americans; *Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); Hmong People; Laotians; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *School Districts; Urban Schools; Vietnamese People
IDENTIFIERS Mien People; *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This paper evaluates the Seattle (Washington) School District's 5-year Bilingual Resource Service Model project. The project aimed to improve bilingual education services for elementary limited English proficient students of Chinese, Laotian/Hmong/Mien, Vietnamese, or Cambodian native language backgrounds by increasing the instructional coordination between the mainstream classroom and the bilingual center in each school. The focus was on coordination in language arts/English as a Second Language, reading instruction, and mathematics instruction. The project began in six sites, with changes taking place over the 5 years. The project format involved a half-time bilingual resource teacher to coordinate classroom instructional programs, 10 instructional assistants, curriculum development, project staff training, and involvement of parents and community members in bilingual education. Results of a process evaluation show the model to have been successfully implemented at all schools. Increased instructional coordination resulted in improved communication between bilingual and mainstream teachers. Also there was better communication between home and school and the level of participation by students' parents improved. Participating students showed improved mathematics achievement; however, they did not demonstrate the expected improvement in reading and language. Qualitative results suggest that the program was successful in other ways. Included are nine tables and two references. Three appendices outline the program designs, five elementary school bilingual programs, and selected sites and program descriptions. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED338271

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

TITLE VII

BILINGUAL RESOURCE SERVICE MODEL

REPORT NO. 89-6
JUNE, 1989

ROBERTA KOOPMAN
MARY KYLE
MADELAINE RAMEY

William M. Kendrick, Superintendent

EVALUATION, EQUITY & COMPLIANCE
Collin Williams, Executive Director

TESTING & EVALUATION OFFICE
Susan Mindenbergs, Manager

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D.G. Colwell
Seattle Pub. Schools
Dept. of Res., Planning Eval.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report could not have been completed without the help of many people to whom we extend our thanks. The Bilingual resource teachers (Mary Chang, Delores Dong, Kim-Van Luu, Nancy Steers and Dan Vu) provided the foundation; they helped develop the data collection forms and implement the program. Their collection of data, narrative reports, and critique of the program were used as the building blocks of the analyses. The finished product owes much to the skills of Beverly Shanahan who managed to turn the disparate work of three people into one polished report.

TITLE VII
BILINGUAL RESOURCE SERVICE MODEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.
Executive Summary		1
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Program Components	6
	A. Instructional Coordination/Instruction	6
	B. Curriculum Development/Materials	7
	C. Staff Development	7
	D. Parent and Community Involvement	8
	E. Additional Activities	8
III.	Evaluation Activities	9
	A. Process Evaluation	9
	1. Evaluation Questions	9
	2. Data Collection Instruments	9
	B. Student Outcome Evaluation	11
	1. Evaluation Questions	11
	2. Project and Control Group Students	13
	3. Data Collection Instruments	16
IV.	Evaluation Findings	16
	A. Process Evaluation Findings	16
	1. Instructional Coordination	17
	2. Curriculum Development	23
	3. Staff Development	23
	4. Parent/Community Involvement	24
	B. Student Outcome Evaluation Findings	25
V.	Discussion/Conclusions	29
References		32
Appendix A		33
Appendix B		37
Appendix C		41

TITLE VII
BILINGUAL RESOURCE SERVICE MODEL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current report is the last for a three-year (1983-86) plus two-year renewal of a Title VII Basic Project grant awarded to the Seattle School District. The Bilingual Resource Service Model project was designed to improve bilingual education services for elementary limited-English proficient (LEP) students of Chinese, Laotian/Hmong/Mien, Vietnamese or Cambodian native language backgrounds. The major thrust of the project was to increase instructional coordination between the mainstream classroom and the bilingual center in each school. Over the five-year duration of the project, the focus has been on coordination in three major instructional areas: language arts/ESL, reading and math. It was hypothesized that effective coordination and development of instructional programs for LEP students would lead to improved student achievement in the three target instructional areas.

While the project began in six school sites, changes were necessary as district policy and personnel staffing changes occurred. Over the five-year duration of the project's implementation, four schools (Adams, Greenwood, Kimball and West Woodland) participated all five years, one school (Beacon Hill) participated the first three years, one school (Laurelhurst) participated the first two years and one school (Coe) participated only the last two years.

The format of the project was for a half-time bilingual resource teacher to coordinate the regular and bilingual classroom instructional programs for target LEP students. In addition, 10 instructional assistants (IAs) worked on a part- or full-time basis to provide bilingual instruction in math. (These same I.A.s also provided ESL and reading instruction but this was funded by the Seattle School District rather than by this project.)

In addition, the project has supported curriculum development, project staff training, and involvement of parents and community members in bilingual education. The project staff was supervised by a project director and supported by a half-time secretary. During the 1986-87 school year, 306 students were served on an annual budget of $288,573 for a cost per student of $943. In 1987-88, 284 students were served on an annual budget of $224,371 for a cost per student of $790.

Results of the process evaluation showed the model to have been successfully implemented at all of the five schools. Increased instructional coordination resulted in improved communication between bilingual and mainstream teachers. Not only have instructional objectives been prioritized and shared by teachers but better understanding of different cultures in each of the schools was also facilitated. The project led to better communication between home and school and improved participation by students' parents. Both staff and curriculum development also took place in all project schools.

The outcome evaluation shows that students who participated in the Bilingual Resource Service Model program showed improved mathematics achievement; however,

they did not meet the standards adopted for demonstrating improvement in reading and language. By spring 1987 more than 75% of project students showed an increase in math concepts and applications achievement (as measured by California Achievement Test math concepts/applications subtest percentile ranks); the amount of scaled score increase was greater, to a statistically significant degree, for project than control students. Comparable results were not obtained for reading or language.

While quantitative results indicate that the project was successful in raising only mathematics achievement levels of the students served by the project, qualitative results suggest that it was successful in other ways.

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the current report is to describe the operation and evaluation findings of the final two years of a five-year (1983-88) Title VII ESEA Basic Project grant awarded to the Seattle School District by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) under contract Number G008322656. This project, entitled the Bilingual Resource Service Model, was designed to improve bilingual education services for elementary Limited English Proficient (LEP) students whose native languages were Chinese, Lao/Hmong/Mien (L/H/M) Vietnamese or Cambodian. The project began in the fall of 1983 as a three year project for which annual reports were written; the final two years of the project were an extension of the original contract and are reported together here.

In the Seattle School District, elementary school LEP students typically spend half of the day or more in a Bilingual Resource Center and half the day or less in a regular English-language classroom. In the past and in non-project schools, the two programs have been separated without systematic coordination between them. Such isolation often leads to duplication of effort and situations may occur in which concepts and skills taught by a teacher in one setting are not reinforced by the teacher in the other setting. Even worse, confusion and interference in learning may occur at times when material being taught in one program is incompatible with material being taught in the other program. In such cases, being in a bilingual program may actually make it more difficult for LEP students to follow the regular coursework in the mainstreamed classroom.

Under this Title VII Basic Program, the Bilingual Resource Service Model has provided a half-time resource teacher and an instructional assistant (IA) in each of five schools. The primary objective of service has been to increase instructional coordination between the mainstream classroom and the bilingual center in each school. The goal of the project has been to better serve target students through the development of instructional programs encompassing curriculum from both regular and bilingual programs in a coordinated and supportive structure. Over the five-year duration of the project, the focus has been on coordination in three major instructional areas: language arts/ESL, reading and math. It was hypothesized that effective coordination and development of instructional programs for LEP students would lead to improved student achievement in the three target instructional areas.

In the final two years of the project the program was implemented in five elementary schools. Four of these were among the original six schools chosen for the project; one school participated only during the final two years. All schools served a K-6 population and were selected on the basis of their high percentages of LEP students never before served under the Title VII Act and their high concentration of LEP students of the target language groups. Tables 1 and 2 list the five project schools and the number of students of each language group served at each site by year. (In order to make quantitative comparisons of students' achievement, seven schools with similar populations were identified and designated as Control schools; their student and language distributions are also listed in Tables 1 and 2, pp. 4 and 5.)

Table 1

School, Grade and Ethnic Group of Experimental and Control Students 1986-87

School	Ethnic Group	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
A. EXPERIMENTAL									
1. Adams	Cambodian	8	7	7	2	4	2	1	
(K-6)	L/H/M	3	4	1	4	0	2	0	
	Vietnamese	6	5	4	4	0	3	1	
	TOTAL	17	16	12	10	4	7	2	68
2. Coe	Chinese	6	11	7	8	4	3	6	
(K-6)	Vietnamese	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	
	L/H/M	10	6	7	6	3	3	1	
	TOTAL	17	19	14	15	7	7	9	88
3. Greenwood	Cambodian	6	10	2	3	1	0	1	
(K-6)	L/H/M	9	15	7	8	5	3	2	
	TOTAL	15	25	9	11	6	3	3	72
4. West Woodland	Vietnamese	2	5	3	4	2	1	1	
(K-6)	L/H/M	1	2	1	4	1	3	1	
	TOTAL	3	7	4	8	3	4	2	31
5. Kimball	Chinese	11	8	5	5	2	2	6	
(K-6)	Vietnamese	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	
	TOTAL	12	9	7	5	3	3	8	47
B. CONTROL									
1. Alki	Cambodian	15	13	9	2	1	4	0	
(K-5)	L/H/M	3	6	9	2	1	2	0	
	TOTAL	18	19	18	4	2	6	0	67
2. Bagley	Vietnamese	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	
(K-5)	TOTAL	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	8
3. Gatewood	Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	
(K, 4-6)	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	13
4. Lafayette	Vietnamese	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	
(K-3)	TOTAL	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	28
5. Latona	Cambodian	7	8	5	2	3	4	0	
(K-5)	L/H/M	3	2	2	1	0	3	0	
	TOTAL	10	10	7	3	3	7	0	40
6. Lowell	L/H/M	14	15	8	5	6	4	0	
(K-5)	TOTAL	14	15	8	5	6	4	0	52
7. North Beach	L/H/M	8	3	3	1	1	0	1	
(K-6)	TOTAL	8	3	3	1	1	0	1	17

Table 2

School, Grade and Ethnic Group of Experimental and Control Students 1987-88

School	Ethnic Group	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
A. **EXPERIMENTAL**									
1. Adams	Cambodian	6	8	5	4	1	1	2	
(K-6)	L/H/M	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
	Vietnamese	0	6	0	3	3	1	2	
	TOTAL	7	16	6	8	5	3	5	50
2. Coe	Chinese	1	7	3	5	6	3	0	
(K-6)	Vietnamese	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	
	L/H/M	0	13	4	5	6	2	2	
	TOTAL	2	20	8	10	12	7	5	64
3. Greenwood	Cambodian	1	9	7	3	4	1	1	
(K-6)	L/H/M	0	14	17	9	9	5	2	
	TOTAL	1	23	24	12	13	6	3	83
4. West Woodland	Vietnamese	1	0	4	2	1	2	0	
(K-6)	L/H/M	0	2	4	2	2	1	2	
	TOTAL	1	2	8	4	3	3	2	24
5. Kimball	Chinese	8	16	7	6	3	5	3	
(K-6)	Vietnamese	2	1	2	2	0	2	3	
	TOTAL	10	17	9	8	3	7	6	60
B. **CONTROL**									
1. Alki	Cambodian	0	17	11	8	3	1	0	
(K-5)	L/H/M	0	8	7	7	2	1	0	
	TOTAL	0	25	18	15	5	2	0	75
2. Bagley	Vietnamese	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	
(K-5)	TOTAL	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	6
3. Gatewood	Cambodian	13	0	0	0	3	2	6	
(K, 4-6)	Vietnamese	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	
	TOTAL	14	0	0	0	4	4	12	34
4. Lafayette	Vietnamese	1	12	8	6	0	0	0	
(K-3)	TOTAL	1	12	8	6	0	0	0	27
5. Latona	Cambodian	0	5	4	6	1	3	0	
(K-5)	L/H/M	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	
	TOTAL	0	5	4	8	3	3	0	23
6. Lowell	L/H/M	22	9	6	7	3	4	0	
(K-5)	TOTAL	22	9	6	7	3	4	0	51
7. North Beach	L/H/M	0	7	3	4	4	2	2	
(K-6)	TOTAL	0	7	3	4	4	2	2	22

As in previous years, each project school was served by a half-time resource teacher whose function was to coordinate between the regular classroom and the Bilingual Center teachers. All resource teachers also taught half-time in the project schools' Bilingual Center with the exception of one teacher who was a half-time employee. The project also supported 10 Instructional Assistants to provide instruction in math. (ESL and reading instruction was also provided by these same IAs but was funded by the Seattle School District.) Languages spoken by the teachers and IAs were as follows:

Adams:	T: Vietnamese	IA: Lao, Hmong, Cambodian, and Vietnamese
Coe:	T: Chinese	IA: Chinese and Lao
Greenwood:	T: Vietnamese	IA: Lao, Hmong, and Cambodian
Kimball:	T: Chinese	IA: Vietnamese and Chinese
West Woodland:	T: German	IA: Lao and Vietnamese

In addition to instructional coordination and bilingual instruction in math, the project also supported curriculum development, project staff training and parent/community involvement in bilingual education. The activities of these components of the project were designed to provide additional support in meeting the goals of increased coordination of instruction and improved student academic achievement.

The budget for each of the final two years of the project was $288,573 and $224,371, respectively; the number of students served was 306 and 284 for each of the respective years. Thus, the cost per student was $943 for 1986-87 and $790 for 1987-88.

II. PROGRAM COMPONENTS

In the effort to improve bilingual services for elementary LEP students of Chinese, Laotian/Hmong/Mein, Vietnamese and Cambodian language backgrounds, the Bilingual Resource Service Model was designed to include the following components:

A. Instructional Coordination / Instruction

The Bilingual Resource Service Model was designed to address the need for improved coordination of services between the regular classroom teachers and the Bilingual Center teachers for students of targeted languages. At each site the project resource teacher managed coordination and linkage of the Bilingual Resource Center instructional program with the regular classroom program for LEP students. In this respect, resource teachers provided support to both the regular and the bilingual center staff.

Instruction for students took place in both the regular classroom and the Bilingual Resource Center. The resource teacher was responsible for monitoring the instructional time in each of the targeted skill areas (language arts/ESL, reading and math). The purpose of such monitoring was to quantify the amount of time LEP students were actually provided with instruction in each of the three areas. Such information is useful in

analyzing differences between sites and in making recommendations for an increase or decrease in instructional time needed by LEP students.

B. Curriculum Development / Materials

Not only did the bilingual resource teachers work on coordination of curriculum objectives between regular and bilingual programs, they also helped develop materials for use by bilingual students, helped translate curriculum materials into students' native languages and helped develop supplemental materials for use in teaching multicultural understanding to regular education students.

A K-6 curriculum guide, developed by a group of Title VII Resource teachers, Bilingual Center teachers, and mainstream teachers focused on the areas of reading and language arts. It was to serve as the basis for teacher communication in designing coordinated instructional programs between the mainstream classroom and the Bilingual Center classroom for the project students. The guide was pilot tested in the spring of 1985 at the project schools. Both mainstream and Bilingual Center teachers found the guide to be useful in working with bilingual students. Unfortunately, the guide was based upon the District's newly adopted reading management system, the Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI). The system did not prove to be successful in this District and was scrapped shortly after it was implemented. The guide contained many useful strategies, methodologies and suggested materials. It is currently being revised to address K-5 bilingual students based on grade level student learning objectives.

C. Staff Development

The staff development component of the project had two primary purposes. First, the project staff was to improve their own skills in order to better serve project students. Activities of this kind included in-service training, attendance at workshops, seminars and courses. Secondly, all project schools' staff personnel were targeted as needing training and orientation in how to better work with the bilingual students in their classes and in the schools.

Many of the resource teachers took credit bearing courses through local universities in the areas of reading, English, cooperative learning, and computer literacy, particularly as they relate to bilingual students. In addition, everyone attended professional development courses and conferences offered by the Seattle School District, the state, and other educational organizations. These included such topics as language and literacy for LEP students, learning styles, gender expectations and student achievement, child abuse, AIDS education, and teaching the LEP student to read. After attending these courses and conferences, the teachers provided an in-service at their buildings to share ideas and materials.

One resource teacher developed a peer tutoring program with manuals and workbooks. Training was provided to students and staff at the school. The focus of the program was to meet the needs of the bilingual student in the mainstream classroom, particularly in reading and spelling. It has been

extremely successful and has been adapted for use with mainstream students.

D. Parent and Community Involvement

The involvement of parents and community members in the educational process is extremely important for the success of bilingual students in school. Parents and community members, newly arrived in the United States, are often unfamiliar with the U.S. educational system and may have different attitudes and cultural values regarding their roles and responsibilities and those of the school. They often tend to isolate themselves from school activities due to language and cultural differences (and perhaps from inexperience in dealing with a school system).

The goal of the parent and community involvement component was to more actively engage this group in the decision-making process regarding their children's education.

During the fourth year of the project, two parent training workshops were held on Saturday mornings. Participants were grouped by language and all presentations were made by bilingual instructional assistants. The agenda included information on the interpretation of report cards, child safety, health care, homework, and a general question and answer period. Handouts were available on local health care clinics, a directory of all current bilingual staff, and the kinds of things that are appropriate (and inappropriate) to bring to school. A carefully planned agenda, transportation, and native language presentations were key factors in the success of the workshop.

For the final project year, it was decided that parent involvement would be addressed individually by each project school. Resource teachers worked to inform parents of school events, arrange transportation for them and provide native language support at the various functions. These functions ranged from spaghetti dinners to multicultural festivals and from open houses to awards assemblies.

E. Additional Activities

In addition to the program components listed above, bilingual resource teachers performed many other duties to assure that the bilingual students and programs were well integrated into each of the schools. These ranged from native-language contact with parents of students to coordinating all-school international programs. These are the types of activities which do not fit neatly into definitions or categories but which may make the difference between a programs's success or failure in a building.

III. EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

To evaluate the effect of the program, two evaluation designs were used. The first design addresses the "process" question:

> Was there increased instructional coordination between mainstream classrooms and the Bilingual Centers?

The second design addresses the "outcome" question:

> Did students show improved academic achievement as a result of program participation?

The process evaluation took a close look at how the project actually operated and the extent to which the Bilingual Resource Service Model, as described in the Introduction and in Section II, was actually implemented in each of the five project schools. This evaluation was based on resource teachers' program narratives and on data sheets detailing student instructional time, resource teacher activities and the degree of curriculum match between regular and bilingual teachers.

Such a process evaluation attempts to provide background information that may be helpful in understanding the student outcome evaluations. Further, it offers comments on many factors which, although not measured in quantifiable fashion, played important roles in the success of the program. Such a "sensitivity to context" is emphasized by Eisner (1985) as an approach to educational evaluation which allows one to see situations from different perspectives. He suggests that one should be concerned with outcomes but also with that which contributes to or creates the outcomes. It is from this view that the process evaluation includes teacher narratives and data regarding how the program functioned and its impact at each school.

The student outcome evaluations are based on student achievement scores and are of two types. In the criterion-referenced model, an absolute level of performance was set as a criterion of program success. In the comparison-group model, an intact control group, similar to the experimental group, was identified and used as a standard of comparison.

A. Process Evaluation

1. Evaluation Questions

Major question: Was there increased instructional coordination between mainstream classrooms and the Bilingual Centers?

Subsidiary questions: Was curriculum development carried out? Was staff development carried out? Was there parent/community involvement in the project?

2. Data Collection Instruments

Several forms were used by teachers in an effort to document the degree of instructional coordination between regular and bilingual classrooms.

In addition, further documentation attempted to show the concurrence between actual project activities and those prescribed by the Model.

a. Curriculum Objective Match Form
This form, revised by teacher and evaluator after the first project year, was designed to document, for each student, the benchmarks which were to be taught and which had been mastered. Twice a year, forms were completed by the regular teachers and shared with the appropriate bilingual teachers and/or IAs for their use in instructional planning. At the end of the year, both regular classroom teachers and bilingual staff marked the benchmarks which each student had completed.

b. Resource Teacher Activity Report

In order to track the actual amount as well as proportions of time which Resource teachers spent on the various activities, a time-tracking form was developed with their help. During 1986-87 this form was used as in previous years; during 1987-88 minor changes were made to reflect that observations made by the resource teacher were of students in either mainstream or bilingual classes rather than of the teachers of these classes. An additional change under Curriculum Development allowed teachers to indicate when they developed supplemental materials at the request of another teacher.

c. Bilingual Grade Level Schedule

In order to assure that students were being served equitably in all schools, teachers were asked to submit an accounting of the periods of time for which students were instructed in each subject matter in either the regular classroom or the Bilingual Center.

d. Title VII Teachers' Questionnaire

For the 1987-88 school year teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning the program's effect on service in each of their schools. They were also asked how they anticipated the loss of the resource teacher to impact the instructional program of bilingual students in the coming year(s).

e. Title VII Principals' Questionnaire

At the end of the 1987-88 school year the principal in each of the project schools was asked to rate the program's activities in terms of the building's needs and in terms of effectiveness.

f. Project Wrap-up Reports

At the end of the entire project each of the Bilingual Resource Service Model teachers was asked to submit a summary of how the project had functioned in his/her respective schools. No particular format was suggested and teachers wrote about both strong and weak

aspects of their programs. These unstructured reports provide a wealth of information about the value of having such a program. These narrative summaries are included for review in Appendix C. They discuss factors that were not included in the other data-tracking forms, such as the resource teachers' roles in helping to improve communication between regular and bilingual staff, helping to develop better cultural understanding, managing administrative details, translating materials to be sent home, involving parents in school activities, scheduling and translating for parent-teacher conferences, troubleshooting, etc. These narrative summaries tend to personalize the activities carried out at each school and help to demonstrate that the function of the resource teacher was much broader than simple coordination of instructional goals. They also help to combat the tendency to rely solely on numbers as a representation of the effectiveness of the program.

B. Student Outcome Evaluation

1. Evaluation Questions

The major outcome evaluation question was, 'Did students show improved academic achievement as a result of participation in the Bilingual Resource Service Model project?' For purposes of measurement and analysis, that question was broken down into the following more specific questions.

a. By spring 1987, did at least 75% of project students better their fall 1985 performance in English reading, as measured by an increase in their CAT reading comprehension subtest percentile ranks?

b. Was the percentage of students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their fall 1985 percentile rank in English reading greater in project than in control schools?

c. Was the average fall 1985 to spring 1987 increase in reading comprehension scores greater for project than for control students?

d. By spring 1987, did at least 75% of project students better their fall 1985 performance in mathematics, as measured by an increase in their CAT math computation and/or math concepts/applications subtest percentile ranks?

e. Were the percentages of students whose spring 1987 percentile ranks exceeded their fall 1985 percentile ranks in math computation and math concepts/applications greater in project than in control schools?

f. Were the average fall 1985 to spring 1987 increases in math computation and math concepts/applications scores greater for project than for control students?

g. By spring 1987, did at least 75% of project students better their spring 1985 performance in English language expression, as measured by an increase in their CAT language expression subtest percentile ranks?[1]

h. Was the percentage of students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their spring 1985 percentile rank in English language expression greater in project than in control schools?

i. Was the average spring 1985 to spring 1987 increase in language expression scores greater for project than for control students?

It will be noted that the arbitrary 80% standard used in the third project year evaluation has been lowered in a and d above. While 75% is no less arbitrary, it was thought to be a more realistic but still adequate criterion against which to assess the effectiveness of the program.

The procedure employed to answer the first, fourth and seventh evaluation questions (a, d, and g) above was simply to compare the observed percentage of project students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their fall 1985 percentage rank on the appropriate CAT subtest against the 75% standard.

In the procedures employed to answer the remaining questions (b, c, e, f, h, and i) a control group provided the standard against which project students were compared. These procedures assume that the project and the control group are similar in all important respects except program participation. Then if the procedure shows superior performance by the project group, we have evidence for the program's effectiveness. Thus, the appropriateness of these procedures depends on the comparability of the two groups, a topic discussed in the following subsection.

The procedure employed to answer the second, fifth and eighth questions (b, e, and h) was to compare the observed percentages of project and control students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their fall 1985 percentage rank on the appropriate CAT subtest. Significance of percentile differences between project and control students was assessed by means of a Chi-square statistic.

The analysis employed to answer the third, sixth and ninth questions (c, d, and i) compared the average fall 1985 to spring 1987 increases, on the appropriate CAT subtest, of project and control students. Significance of differences in average increases of project and control students was assessed by means of a t-test. The t-test was applied to

---

[1] Bilingual students were not administered the language expression and subtest in fall 1985; for purposes of this evaluation, project and control students' spring 1985 language expression subtest scores were pulled from computer files and used instead.

the standardized change scores of students in the two groups.[2]

2. Project and Control Group Students

All of the analyses performed to answer the nine outcome evaluation questions were based on students who were in the project in its third year, 1985-86, excluding those who left before spring 1987 or who attended Beacon Hill school, which was no longer a project school after the third year. Similarly, all of the analyses requiring a control group used, in addition to project students, students who were in a control school in 1985-86, excluding those who left before spring 1987 or who attended Coe school, which became a project school after the third project year. Table 3, p. 14, shows the numbers, by school, of project and control students who were enrolled in the program in Fall 1985 and continued to be enrolled in Spring 1987.

The project and control groups are compared on 7 biographic and demographic variables in Table 4, p. 15. These variables are ethnicity, grade level, sex, bilingual status (newcomer vs. regular bilingual), immigration status (refugee vs. nonrefugee), person(s) the student is living with, and free or reduced price lunch eligibility. The purpose of the comparison is to see if the two groups can be considered at least roughly equivalent with respect to these background characteristics.

Table 4 shows a statistically significant chi-square values associated with ethnicity, sex, and immigration status (refugee, nonrefugee). The significant ethnicity chi-square value is that obtained after Chinese students are removed from the comparison and reflects the relatively larger number of Vietnamese in the control group as compared with the project group. The Chinese students were removed from the comparison and from further analyses because they lacked any counterparts in the control group.

---

[2] The fall 1985 and spring 1987 subtest scores were separately transformed to have zero mean and unit standard deviation (by subtracting subtest mean from each score and dividing by subtest standard deviation) across the two groups. Each student's change score was calculated by taking the difference between his two transformed scores and the t-test was applied to the resultant change scores. This procedure is recommended by Kenny (1975) to rule out a group differences (as opposed to treatment differences) explanation for results when the treatment (project) and control groups are nonequivalent because their members go to different schools.

TABLE 3

NUMBERS OF PROJECT AND CONTROL STUDENTS, BY SCHOOL*

PROJECT GROUP

School	Number
Adams	42
Greenwood	70
West Woodland	20
Kimball	3
	135

CONTROL GROUP

School	Number
Alki	49
Bagley	10
Gatewood	8
Lafayette	13
Latona	23
Lowell	28
North Beach	20
	258

* These are numbers of students who were enrolled in the program in Fall 1985 and continued to be enrolled in Spring 1987. However, both test scores were not available for all of these students so not all were included in the outcome evaluation. They do not include Chinese students who were excluded because they lacked any counterparts in the control group.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF PROJECT AND CONTROL GROUPS ON SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variable	Category	Project Group N	Project Group %	Control Group N	Control Group %	Chi-Square[3]
Ethnicity	Chinese[4]	33	-	0	-	
	Vietnamese	12	8.9	31	20.5	8.61* (df=2)
	Cambodian	53	39.3	44	29.1	
	Lao-Mien-Hmong	70	51.9	76	50.3	
Grade (Spring 1986)	Kindergarten	25	18.5	28	18.5	5.79 (df=6)
	1st	28	20.7	43	28.5	
	2nd	34	25.2	27	17.9	
	3rd	16	11.9	23	15.2	
	4th	23	17.0	22	14.6	
	5th	9	6.7	7	4.6	
	6th	0	-	1	.7	
Sex	Female	69	51.1	64	42.4	1.85* (df=1)
	Male	66	48.9	87	57.6	
Bilingual Status	Regular Bilingual	68	50.7	88	58.3	1.34 (df=1)
	Newcomer	66	49.3	63	41.7	
Immigration Status	Refugee	99	73.3	97	64.2	2.33* (df=1)
	Nonrefugee	36	26.7	54	35.8	
Person(s) Living With	Both Parents	96	72.2	111	73.5	.96 (df=2)
	Single Parent	36	27.1	37	24.5	
	Alone or Guardian	1	.8	3	2.0	
Free or Reduced Price Lunch	Eligible	112	83.0	124	82.1	.00 (df=1)
	Not Eligible	23	17.0	27	17.9	

* $p < .20$

[3]Chi-square was corrected for discontinuity in tests with degrees of freedom (df) equal to 1.

[4]The 33 Chinese students in the project group were excluded from further analyses because they lacked any counterparts in the control group.

Caution should be used in interpreting the results of analyses comparing project and control group students. To the extent that ethnicity, sex, and/or immigration status influence the outcome variables, test scores, results of project/control group comparisons could be confounded.

3. Data Collection Instruments

The California Achievement Test (CAT) was the single data collection instrument used in the student outcome evaluation. The evaluation covers three administrations of the CAT, one in fall of 1985, the next in spring 1986, and the last in spring 1987. Results of the first two administrations were described in the third project year, 1985-86, evaluation report. Results of the spring 1987 administration, particularly as they compare with those for fall 1985, are reported here. Unfortunately, it was not possible to extend the comparison to include CAT scores for the fifth and final project year, 1987-88, because the school district adopted a new version, with new norms, of the CAT during that year.

The CAT subtests used in this evaluation are: Reading Comprehension, Math Computation, Math Concepts and Applications, and Language Expression. The subtests used differ in two respects from those used in the third year evaluation.

The Letter Sound subtest is not used here because of the two-year span of this evaluation; the Letter Sound subtest is administered only at the kindergarten level. The Language Expression subtest is used here because it was deemed a more appropriate measure of language achievement than the oral proficiency test, the Language Assessment Scale (LAS), which was originally proposed as the project's language assessment measure.

The reader is referred to the third project year report for a more detailed description of the California Achievement Test.

IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Process evaluation findings, those relating to the project's implementation, are presented first in this section. They are followed by the outcome evaluation findings which are those relating to project students' academic achievement.

A. Process Evaluation Findings

Narrative summaries of the five-year duration of the program from each of the teachers were used to document how the program was actually implemented at each of the schools. (Descriptions of programs in both control and project schools can be found in Appendices A and B, pp. 35-42.)

1. Instructional Coordination

The major process evaluation question asked, "Was there increased instructional coordination between mainstream classrooms and Bilingual Centers?" The following descriptions of program activities support an affirmative response to the question.

The primary focus of the Bilingual Resource Service Model was to facilitate coordination between the mainstream classrooms and the Bilingual Center in each school. Comments from all five teachers indicate that the major value has been to improve communication between bilingual and mainstream teachers. More effective coordination of curriculum has led to a more shared sense of ownership in the educational progress of bilingual students. Better communication also allowed specific instructional objectives to be prioritized and shared by both bilingual and mainstream teachers. Resource teachers were also able, because of time allocated, to take a leadership role in determining and guiding progress toward both instructional and program goals.

Another focus of coordination has been to facilitate better understanding of different cultures in each of the schools. Activities included creating bulletin boards, putting on a cultural breakfast, organizing school or community-wide multicultural fairs and helping mainstream teachers integrate multicultural materials into the curriculum.

Coordination between home and school was also facilitated by the resource teacher. Again, communication was the priority in that translation of materials, conferences, newsletters, etc. was necessary for parents to participate. In addition, counseling of the parents as to the school's role and expectations was important in promoting better parent participation.

a. Curriculum Objective Match Form

While the Curriculum Objective Match Forms were important in documenting program implementation, their most important function was to serve as a springboard for communication between mainstream and bilingual teachers. As bilingual teachers and IAs became aware of the student learning objectives in the regular classroom, they could begin to talk with the teachers about group and individual student needs, ability levels and appropriate materials. Likewise, as the regular teachers became aware of what the bilingual teachers could do beyond simple ESL lessons, they began to see the bilingual program as a resource for individualizing and reinforcing what they taught in their classrooms. The form facilitated a process of co-planning with the aim of ensuring that the two learning situations supported each other.

Data from the Curriculum Objective Match Forms indicates that at the early grade levels bilingual and mainstream teachers matched on most of the objectives to be taught. As bilingual students began to progress through the grades, the matching of objectives became less

exact. While mainstream teachers generally taught only to the objectives at their grade level, bilingual teachers often were helping students master objectives which had not been met at previous grade levels. A strictly numerical accounting of the objectives matched would be misleading; a high proportion of matches at the early grades gradually became a low proportion of matches at the higher grades as students were brought to competency in skills which had been incomplete. Thus, the Curriculum Objective Match not only led to better communication between teachers but also resulted in more flexibility to individualize instruction to meet the specific needs of students.

b. Resource Teacher Activity Reports

Other activities of the resource teachers also led to better functioning of the bilingual program as a whole and, thus, to better service provision for students. Tables 5 and 6, pp. 19 and 20, indicate the average hours and percentage of time teachers spent in various activities per month. Administrative duties such as scheduling and evaluation/testing activities such as administration of the Language Assessment Scale and the California Achievement Test (CAT) by the resource teachers freed the bilingual teachers from such duties and allowed them more contact time with students. Activities such as observation, curriculum development, and offering inservice training were of benefit to both bilingual and mainstream teachers.

While the model did not specifically indicate that the resource teachers would spend project time in actual instruction, their narrative reports and activities sheets indicate that they did so. Such instruction took place not only with bilingual students but also with mainstream students and teachers as resource teachers helped teach cross-cultural understanding. Much instruction was also given to parents as they learned about and adjusted to American schooling (see Parent Involvement section).

Other teacher activities do not fit neatly into categories yet are important to mention as they are illustrative of the breadth of service provided by the Resource Teachers. These included such things as: borrowing camp equipment so that students could go to Outdoor Education Camp; meeting weekly with the principal to review students' progress; providing conflict resolution between mainstream and bilingual teachers and students; establishing a peer tutoring program; serving on the Child Study Team; translating Special Education forms; making multicultural bulletin boards for the school; providing cultural materials; translating letters from/for pen-pals; and, serving as counselor and support for students with special needs.

Table 5

Average Number of Hours and Percentage of Time Spent Per Month on Different Project Activities (November 1986 - June 1987)

	ADAMS		COE*		GREENWOOD		KIMBALL		W. WOODLAND		AVERAGE	
ACTIVITY	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%
COMMUNICATE W/												
Classroom Teachers	7.1	14.9	4.2	7.8	1.8	3.2	6.4	13.1	18.0	35.9	7.5	14.8
Bil Cntr Teachers	2.9	6.1	3.3	6.2	1.8	3.2	2.8	5.7	6.1	12.2	3.4	6.7
Bldg Principal	.6	1.3	2.4	4.5	1.5	2.7	1.2	2.4	3.3	6.6	1.8	3.6
Project Manager	.2	.4	.7	1.3	.8	1.4	.6	1.2	1.4	2.8	.7	1.4
Parents/Community	2.9	6.1	3.7	6.9	2.3	4.1	4.5	9.2	1.6	3.2	3.0	5.9
Students	4.6	9.7	2.6	4.9	2.1	3.8	2.6	5.3	.9	1.8	2.6	5.1
I.A.s/Tutors	5.0	10.5	3.0	5.6	1.7	3.0	2.7	5.5	3.3	6.6	3.1	6.1
Support Services	2.3	4.8	5.0	9.3	3.7	6.6	2.3	4.7	4.0	8.0	3.5	6.9
TOTAL	25.6	53.9%	27.6	51.5%	15.7	28.1%	23.1	47.1%	38.6	77.0%	25.6	50.5%
ADMINISTRATION												
Scheduling	2.6	5.5	1.1	2.1	2.5	4.5	.6	1.2	1.3	2.6	1.6	3.2
Data Collection	4.2	8.8	4.3	8.0	6.4	11.5	2.2	4.5	1.9	3.8	3.8	7.5
Staff Meetings	3.2	6.7	4.0	7.5	4.8	8.6	4.2	8.6	2.3	4.6	3.7	7.3
Dist. Curr. Mtgs	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
TOTAL	10.0	21.1%	9.4	17.5%	13.7	24.6%	7.0	14.3%	5.5	11.0%	9.1	17.9%
EVALUATION												
LAS	.4	.8	.0	.0	1.2	2.2	.2	.4	.0	.0	.4	.8
CAT	.4	.8	.3	.6	2.0	3.6	.4	.8	.0	.0	.6	1.2
Other	.0	.0	1.4	2.6	.4	.7	.2	.4	.0	.0	.4	.9
Progress Reports	.6	1.3	.6	1.1	2.3	4.1	.8	1.6	.0	.0	.9	1.8
TOTAL	1.4	2.9%	2.3	4.3%	5.9	10.6%	1.6	3.3%	.9	.0%	2.3	4.6%
INSTRUCTION												
Field Trips	.1	.2	.0	.0	1.0	1.8	1.4	2.9	.3	.6	.6	1.2
Multicultural Act.	1.0	2.1	1.8	3.4	2.9	5.2	1.1	2.2	1.7	3.4	1.7	3.4
TOTAL	1.1	2.3%	1.8	3.4%	3.9	7.0%	2.5	5.1%	2.0	4.0%	2.3	4.6%
OBSERVATION -												
of classroom teacher	.2	.4	2.0	3.7	.8	1.4	2.9	5.9	.1	.2	1.2	2.4
of Bil. Ctr. teacher	.9	1.9	1.9	3.5	.2	.3	2.1	4.3	.1	.2	1.0	2.0
I.A.s/Tutors	.8	1.7	2.5	4.7	.3	.5	1.5	3.1	.4	.8	1.1	2.2
TOTAL	1.9	4.0%	6.4	11.9%	1.3	2.3%	6.5	13.3%	.6	1.2%	3.3	6.6%
CURRICULUM DEVELOP.												
Select./Review Mat.	2.3	4.8	1.7	3.2	2.7	4.8	1.7	3.5	1.4	2.8	2.0	3.9
Adapt Mat. for LEP	1.8	3.8	2.3	4.3	1.8	3.2	1.9	3.9	1.5	3.0	1.9	3.7
Man. Title VII Mat.	1.6	3.4	1.0	1.9	1.3	2.3	.8	1.6	.0	.0	.9	1.8
Devel. Supple. Mat.	1.8	3.8	1.1	2.1	2.8	5.0	1.3	2.7	.5	1.0	1.5	3.0
TOTAL	7.5	15.8%	6.1	11.4%	8.6	15.4%	5.7	11.6%	3.4	6.8%	6.3	12.4%
INSERVICE												
Attend Workshop	.0	.0	.0	.0	3.3	5.9	1.8	3.7	.0	.0	1.0	2.0
Teacher Training	.0	.0	.0	.0	3.4	6.1	.8	1.6	.0	.0	.8	1.6
TOTAL	.0	.0	.0	.0	6.7	12.0%	2.6	5.3%	.0	.0%	1.8	3.6%
TOTAL HOURS	47.5		53.6		55.8		49.0		50.1		50.7	100.2%

* Data only for February 1987 - June 1987.

Table 6

Average Number of Hours and Percentage of Time Spent Per Month on Different Project Activities (September 1987 - June 1988)

	ADAMS		COE		GREENWOOD		KIMBALL		W. WOODLAND		AVERAGE	
ACTIVITY	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%	# Hrs	%
COMMUNICATE W/												
Classroom Teachers	8.0	16.7	4.3	8.6	1.7	3.3	4.5	8.8	14.3	27.4	6.8	13.1
Bil Cntr Teachers	2.7	5.6	2.7	5.4	1.7	3.3	3.5	6.8	4.3	8.3	3.0	5.9
Bldg Principal	.5	1.0	1.8	3.6	1.7	3.3	1.2	2.3	8.5	16.3	2.7	5.3
Project Manager	.1	.2	.3	.6	.8	1.2	.4	.8	1.8	3.6	.7	1.4
Parents/Community	2.8	5.8	2.6	5.2	1.4	2.7	4.8	9.4	2.2	4.2	2.8	5.5
Students	3.4	7.1	2.1	4.2	1.6	3.1	2.7	5.3	2.1	4.0	2.4	4.8
I.A.s/Tutors	5.8	12.1	2.8	5.6	1.7	3.3	2.3	4.5	3.1	6.0	3.1	6.1
Support Services	2.8	5.8	4.6	9.1	4.0	7.8	2.0	3.9	3.0	5.8	3.3	6.5
TOTAL	26.1	54.4%	21.2	42.3%	14.4	28.1%	21.4	41.8%	39.4	75.6%	24.6	48.7%
ADMINISTRATION												
Scheduling	2.3	4.8	.9	1.8	1.9	3.7	1.3	2.5	1.0	1.9	1.5	3.0
Data Collection	3.6	7.5	2.8	5.6	4.9	9.6	3.1	6.1	2.8	5.0	3.4	6.7
Staff Meetings	1.3	2.7	3.1	6.2	3.8	7.4	3.6	7.0	.1	.2	2.4	4.8
Dist. Curr. Mtgs	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
TOTAL	7.2	15.0%	6.8	13.6%	10.6	20.7%	8.0	15.6%	3.7	7.1%	7.3	14.5%
EVALUATION												
LAS	1.3	2.7	2.6	5.2	3.8	7.4	.1	.2	1.1	2.1	1.8	3.6
CAT	.2	.4	.2	.4	1.4	2.7	1.1	2.1	.0	.0	.6	1.2
Other	.0	.0	1.6	3.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.3	.6
Progress Reports	.3	.6	.8	1.6	3.9	7.6	.9	1.8	.0	.0	1.2	2.4
TOTAL	1.8	3.8%	5.2	10.4%	9.1	17.8%	2.1	4.1%	1.1	2.1%	3.9	7.8%
INSTRUCTION												
Field Trips	.0	.0	1.2	2.4	2.4	4.7	.9	1.8	1.6	3.1	1.2	2.4
Multicultural Act.	2.8	5.8	1.8	3.6	3.5	6.8	2.0	3.9	2.5	4.8	2.5	5.0
TOTAL	2.8	5.8%	3.0	6.0%	5.9	11.5%	2.9	5.7%	4.1	7.9%	3.7	7.4%
OBSERVATION -												
of Students/Mainst.	.2	.4	1.7	3.4	.0	.0	3.6	7.0	.1	.2	1.1	2.2
of Students/Bil Ct.	1.0	2.1	1.8	3.4	.0	.0	1.7	3.3	.6	1.2	1.0	2.0
I.A.s/Tutors	.5	1.0	1.8	3.4	.2	.4	2.1	4.1	.0	.0	.9	1.8
TOTAL	1.7	3.5%	5.3	10.6%	.2	.4%	7.4	14.4%	.7	1.3%	3.0	5.9%
CURRICULUM DEVELOP.												
Select./Review Mat.	2.4	5.0	1.9	3.8	2.6	5.1	1.6	3.1	.0	.0	1.7	3.4
Adapt Mat. for LEP	2.5	5.2	2.3	4.6	2.6	5.1	2.2	4.2	1.0	1.9	2.1	4.2
Man. Title VII Mat.	1.4	2.9	.8	1.6	1.6	3.1	1.3	2.5	.0	.0	1.0	2.0
Devel. Supple. Mat.	2.1	4.4	2.4	4.8	.9	1.7	1.3	2.5	.0	.0	1.3	2.6
TOTAL	8.4	17.5%	7.4	14.8%	7.7	15.1%	6.4	12.5%	1.0	1.9%	6.1	12.1%
INSERVICE												
Attend Workshop	.0	.0	1.2	2.4	3.2	6.2	2.1	4.1	.0	.0	1.3	2.6
Teacher Training	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9	1.8	2.1	4.0	.6	1.2
TOTAL	.0	.0	1.2	2.4%	3.2	6.2%	3.0	5.9%	2.1	4.0%	1.9	3.8%
TOTAL HOURS	48.0		50.1		51.1		51.2		52.1		50.5	100.2%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

c. Bilingual Grade Level Schedules

Table 7, p. 22, shows the average time spent in the Bilingual Center for each of the three curriculum areas. Figures have been averaged across grade 1-6 (where possible) for ease of interpretation; kindergarten students were not included as they were served on an average of only 30 minutes/day, 3 times/week. Data from Table 7 indicates that newcomer bilingual students spent approximately twice as much time in the Bilingual Center as did the regular bilingual students.

d. Title VII Teachers' Questionnaire

For the 1987-88 school year, teachers were asked to evaluate the program's effect on service in each of their schools and to anticipate how the loss of the resource teacher would impact the instructional program of bilingual students in the coming year(s). All of the teachers indicated that improved communication resulting from resource teachers' activities had led to more efficient and effective coordination of curriculum as well as increased understanding between teachers, IAs, students, and parents. Both classroom and bilingual staff shared the responsibilities (and ownership) for students and considered themselves integral parts of the educational process for bilingual students. The resource teacher has been able to serve as a leader to guide the instructional program of LEP students and to coordinate activities among the various services they receive.

Loss of the resource teacher will make such coordination difficult. There will not be any one person responsible to oversee the students' programs nor to monitor their progress. Efforts to match/coordinate curriculum objectives will have to be taken over by individual teachers. Because teachers may not have the time to regularly coordinate instructional plans, they may not know what students are learning in their other classes. Further, lack of coordination of support services (dental/medical, special education intervention, etc.) will put those responsibilities back on the regular or bilingual teachers. Teachers will have to do many non-instructional activities themselves and will have less time to actually teach.

e. Title VII Principals' Questionnaire

At the end of the 1987-88 school year, the principal in each of the project schools was asked to complete a brief questionnaire to rate the program's activities in terms of the building's needs and in terms of effectiveness. Four of the five principals felt that activities such as coordination of curriculum, cultural activities, scheduling of IAs and tutors had been needed. Three of four felt that coordination of class schedules, materials, assessment and supplemental activities had been needed while one felt that these were less essential activities for the resource teacher. (One principal did not respond to this portion of the survey.)

Table 7

Average Number of Minutes Per Day Students Spent in Bilingual Center and Mainstream Classroom for Different Curriculum Areas
Regular ESL Students (B-80s)

	Bilingual Center					Mainstreamed								Grand
	ESL	RDG	Math	Other: SS/Sci	Total	Rdg	LA	Math	SS	Sci	Music PE	Other: Health	Total	Total
Adams K-6	15	10	15	15	55	45	55	35	25	25	35	25	245	300
Coe 1-3	15	00	10	10	35	60	50	45	25	25	30	30	265	300
4-6	20	00	10	15	45	60	30	45	30	30	30	30	255	300
Greenwood K-6	30	15	15	00	60	60	30	35	20	35	30	30	240	300
Kimball 1-2	30	27	3	00	60	90		60		50	30	40	270	330
3-6	30	24	6	00	60	00	00			40(6)	30	50(6)	270	330
W.Woodland 1-3	40	00	00	00	40	50	40	50	30	30	30	30	260	300
4-6	30	00	00	00	30	50	60	50	20	30	30	30	270	300

Bilingual Newcomer Students (B-82s)

	Bilingual Center					Mainstreamed								Grand
	ESL	RDG	Math	Other: SS/Sci	Total	Rdg	LA	Math	SS	Sci	Music PE	Other: Health	Total	Total
Adams	30	45	15	30	120	35	25	30	15	15	40	30	180	300
Coe	30	60	15	25	130	00	20	45	30	15	30	30	170	300
Greenwood	30	30	30	30	120	35	30	25	15	15	30	30	180	300
Kimball	- NA -													
W.Woodland 3-6 Only	30	30	30	30	120	50	40	45	15	00	30	00	180	300

Four of five principals agreed that the resource teacher was needed to coordinate curriculum and that he/she had induced better communication between regular and bilingual teachers. Three of five felt that the presence of the resource teacher had allowed the regular and bilingual teachers more time to teach. Four of the five felt that materials provided by the Title VII project had been useful in providing support both in the classrooms and for coordination. Only one principal felt that the resource teacher position had not been beneficial and that the teacher should have spent more time teaching rather than coordinating. Another (different) principal astutely noted that the key to success of any program is in the personality represented in the coordinator.

f. Project Wrap-up Reports

Teachers' narrative summaries are included for review in Appendix C. They discuss factors that were not included in the other data-tracking forms, such as the resource teachers' roles in helping to improve communication between regular and bilingual staff, helping to develop better cultural understanding, managing administrative details, translating materials to be sent home, involving parents in school activities, scheduling and translating for parent-teacher conferences, troubleshooting, etc.. These narrative summaries reveal the personal character of many of the activities carried out at each school and help to demonstrate that the role of the resource teacher was much broader than simple coordination of instructional goals. They also help to combat the tendency to rely solely on numbers as a representation of the effectiveness of the program.

2. Curriculum Development

The subsidiary process evaluation question, "Was curriculum development carried out?" can be answered in the affirmative. Curriculum development which was carried out involved translating materials into students' native languages and adapting or creating materials for use in teaching multicultural understanding. Materials purchased through the project included both student and teacher books, computer software, dictionaries, and art supplies. Materials purchased were carefully selected by bilingual staff and classroom teachers based on the special needs of students; the goal was to select materials to match the developmental levels of the students. When materials were not available, teachers and IAs modified, re-wrote, and/or translated as needed to adjust materials to the student's level.

3. Staff Development

The subsidiary process evaluation question, "Was staff development carried out?" can be answered affirmatively. The staff development component had as its objectives both the improvement of the project staff's skills and a better understanding by the schools' staffs of multicultural differences. Project teachers attended a number of courses and workshops. These included District in-service workshops on topics

such as multicultural resources, child abuse, AIDS, and art instruction. Courses attended outside the District included the Northwest Language Development Specialist Academy, Leadership for Equity and Excellence Seminar, Puget Sound Writing Workshop, and Asian Studies Institute. Other workshops on problem-solving, learning styles, and computer literacy were attended by several of the project teachers.

Staff training for teachers and IAs in the project schools included two presentations (at Adams and Coe) on how to help LEP students in the classroom. Cultural understanding was promoted by advocating for students and working closely with other staff, both demonstrating cultural activities and lending materials.

Four of the five schools organized an all-school multicultural event. At three of the schools this centered around the Chinese or Lunar New Year; the fourth was a multicultural/multiarts program in which mainstream teachers also integrated cultural information into their curriculum.

All of the project teachers commented in their narratives that they felt the project had helped to promote better understanding between the different cultures in the schools. Such increased understanding and cooperation reflects the fact that teachers, staff, and students became more knowledgeable about other cultures and language backgrounds.

4. Parent/Community Involvement

The final subsidiary process evaluation question, "Was there parent/community involvement in the project?" can be answered affirmatively. The involvement of parents and community members in students' educational process is especially important for bilingual students' success in school. Because parents who have recently arrived in the United States are often unfamiliar with the U.S. educational system and may have different attitudes and cultural values regarding their roles and responsibilities and those of the school, the goal of the parent and community involvement component was to engage this group more actively in the decision making process regarding their children's education.

Each school provided a wide range of parent activities. All held at least one parent meeting each year to discuss the school program, homework, parent-teacher conferences, report cards, and school activities such as carnival, multicultural programs, Science Fair, field trips, outdoor camp, etc.. In addition, information was shared with parents regarding hygiene, lice, immunizations, amount of sleep children need, how to discipline children and the role of Children's Protective Service, fire safety at home, etc.. Many parents who had recently arrived in this country were unfamiliar with such concerns. Meetings and letters were also sent home to instruct parents in the ways of our culture. One resource teacher also sent information to parents to teach them about the holidays in this country and arranged buses for parents to come to school for Open House.

Three schools translated the school handbook (philosophy) and the school newsletter into the students' languages for parents to read; they also translated other letters home and helped parents confer with teachers regarding individual students' progress. Three teachers helped coordinate scheduling to assure good attendance at parent-teacher conferences. Resource teachers took an active role in translating, explaining, and getting parent permission for outdoor camp and field trips and in two schools were able to get parents to help in supervising field trips. An important part of their efforts also went to insuring that students received needed health or social services; this involved communication, translation, and coordination with the school nurse and many other agencies.

B. Student Outcome Evaluation Findings

The answer to the major outcome evaluation question can be stated, Students who participated in the Bilingual Resource Service Model program showed improved mathematics achievement; however they did not meet the standards adopted for demonstrating improvement in reading and language achievement.

A more detailed statement of the student outcome evaluation findings is given below, as answers to the nine questions listed in the Outcome Evaluation Questions section of this report.

1. **By spring 1987, fewer than 75% of project students had bettered their fall 1985 performance in English reading, as measured by an increase in their CAT reading comprehension subtest percentile ranks.**

   The first row of Table 8, p. 27, shows that only 62.8% of project students had a reading comprehension percentile rank that was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985.

2. **The percentage of students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their fall 1985 percentile rank on the CAT reading comprehension subtest was not greater, to a statistically significant degree, in project than in control schools.**

   The first row of Table 8 also shows that the percentage of students whose reading comprehension percentile rank was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985 was slightly smaller for the project group, 62.8%, than for the control group, 65.2%.

3. **The average fall 1985 to spring 1987 increase in reading comprehension scores was not greater, to a statistically significant degree, for project than for control students.**

   The first row of Table 9, p. 28, shows that the average increase in reading comprehension scores was 68.8 (scale score units) for project students, compared with 76.1 for control students; the difference (7.3), which actually favors the control group, is not statistically significant.

4. **By spring 1987, fewer than 75% of project students had bettered their fall 1985 math computation performance, but 75% had bettered their math concepts/applications performance, as measured by increases in their percentile ranks on these two CAT subtests.**

   The second row of Table 8, p. 27, shows that only 63.7% of project students had a math computation percentile rank that was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985. However, the third row of Table 8 shows that 75% of project students had a math concepts/applications percentile rank that was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985.

5. **The percentage of students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their fall 1985 percentile rank was greater, to a statistically significant degree, in project than in control schools for both math computation and math concepts/applications.**

   The second and third rows of Table 8 also show that the percentage of students whose percentile rank was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985 was considerably greater for the project than for the control group, for both math computation (63.7% versus 47.8%) and math concepts/applications (75% versus 49.6%). Both differences between project and control groups are statistically significant.

6. **The average fall 1985 to spring 1987 increase in math computation scores was greater, to a statistically significant degree, for project than for control students; the average fall 1985 to spring 1987 increase in math concepts/applications scores was not significantly greater for project than for control students.**

   The second row of Table 9, p. 28, shows that the average increase in math computation scores was 97.5 (scale score units) for project students, compared with 82.2 for control students; the difference (15.3), which favors the project group, is statistically significant.

   The third row of Table 9 shows that the average increase in math concepts/applications scores was 73.1 (scale score units) for project students, compared with 64.9 for control students; the difference (8.2), although favoring the project group, is not statistically significant.

7. **By spring 1987, fewer than 75% of project students had bettered their spring 1985 performance in English language expression, as measured by an increase in their CAT language expression subtest percentile ranks.**

   The last row of Table 8, p. 27, shows that only 66% of project students had a language expression percentile rank that was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985.

8. **The percentage of students whose spring 1987 percentile rank exceeded their spring 1985 percentile rank on the CAT language expression subtest was not greater, to a statistically significant degree, in project than in control schools.**

Table 8

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PROJECT AND CONTROL GROUP STUDENTS WHOSE SPRING 1987 PERCENTILE RANK EXCEEDS THEIR FALL 1985 PERCENTILE RANK, BY CAT SUBTEST

Subtest	Project Group N	Project Group %	Control Group N	Control Group %	Chi-Square[5]
Reading Comprehension	54 (86)[6]	62.8	60 (92)	65.2	.03 (df-1)
Math Computation	54 (85)	63.7	54 (113)	47.8	4.23* (df-1)
Math Concepts/ Applications	66 (88)	75.0	56 (113)	49.6	12.39** (df-1)
Language Expressions[7]	35 (53)	66.0	38 (61)	62.3	.05 (df-1)

* $.01 < p < .05$

** $p < .01$

1/31/89

[5]Chi-square was corrected for continuity in all four tests, since degrees of freedom (df) equal 1 for all four tests.

[6]Numbers in parentheses are total N's, the number of students on whom test scores are available for both fall 1985 and spring 1987.

[7]The spring 1987 percentile rank for the Language Expression subtest was compared with the spring (not fall) 1985 Language Expression percentile rank. (See narrative for explanation.)

Table 9

FALL 1985 AND SPRING 1987 SCALE SCORE STATISTICS
FOR PROJECT AND CONTROL GROUP

	PROJECT GROUP				CONTROL GROUP				
Subtest	N	Fall 1985 Scale Score Mean (and Standard Deviation)	Spring 1987 Scale Score Mean (and Standard Deviation)	Mean Scale Score Gain	N	Fall 1985 Scale Score Mean (and Standard Deviation)	Spring 1987 Scale Score Mean (and Standard Deviation)	Mean Scale Score Gain	Difference in Mean Gains[8]
Reading Comprehension	89	342.5 (64.6)	411.3 (53.3)	68.8	92	330.5 (68.5)	406.6 (66.1)	76.1	-7.3
Math Computation	87	340.2 (71.4)	437.7 (66.8)	97.5	113	323.7 (73.4)	405.9 (70.9)	82.2	15.3**
Math Concepts/ Applications	90	340.7 (50.2)	413.8 (46.0)	73.1	113	335.7 (51.3)	400.6 (52.5)	64.9	8.2
Language Expression	56	350.6 (80.7)[9]	448.5 (52.5)	97.9	62	364.9 (49.0)	442.9 (47.1)	78.0	19.9#

** $p < .01$

Although the difference, 19.9, in Language Expression mean gains is larger than that, 15.3, for Math Computation, it is not statistically significant because of its larger error variance.

1/31/89

[8]The statistical test to compare project and control students was applied to the difference in standardized gain scores. The differences shown here are unstandardized.

[9]Language Expression scores were obtained from the spring (rather than the fall) 1985 CAT administration.

The last row of Table 8, p. 27, also shows that the percentage of students whose language expression percentile rank was higher in spring 1987 than in fall 1985 was only slightly greater for the project group, 66%, than for the control group, 62.3%. The difference between the two percentages is not statistically significant.

9. **The average spring 1985 to spring 1987 increase in language expression scores was not greater, to a statistically significant degree, for project than for control students.**

The last row of Table 9, p. 28, shows that the average increase in language expression scores was 97.9 (scale score units) for project students, compared with 78.0 for control students; the difference (19.9), although favoring the project group, is not statistically significant.

V. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

The original objective of this project was to increase instructional coordination between the mainstream classroom and the bilingual center in each school. This objective is subsumed under the goal of better serving target students through the development of instructional programs encompassing curriculum from both regular and bilingual programs in a coordinated and supportive structure. The major instructional focus has been on coordination in three major instructional areas: language arts/ESL, reading and math. It was hypothesized that effective coordination and development of instructional programs for LEP students would lead to improved student achievement in the three target instructional areas.

Process evaluation has shown that there was indeed increased coordination between bilingual and mainstream teachers. Having the Resource teacher available to do administrative, programming, and student progress-tracking tasks allowed the teachers more time and flexibility to communicate and plan together. The curriculum match forms facilitated planning for each student individually between his/her mainstream teacher and the bilingual teacher. While the original goal had been to "match" curriculum objectives, data from the forms suggested that this actually happened only in the lower grades. At the higher grades it was found that the bilingual teachers were teaching to objectives of the lower grades which had not yet been met by the students. While this was not the original intent of the project, it seems a worthwhile application of the bilingual teachers' efforts, particularly as the mainstream teachers usually do not have the time to go back and teach missing content or concepts to a few students who may lack them.

Evaluation results also showed the project schools to have benefitted from the project in less direct ways. Increased communication and coordination led to better cultural understanding between both students and staffs. Bilingual students, both regular ESL students and newcomers, participated more fully in the school activities such as science fairs, Outdoor Education and multicultural fairs; mainstream students gained better understanding of others through peer

tutoring, bulletin boards, cultural materials shared with their classes, multicultural fairs and friendships with the bilingual students. Improved communication with the parents of bilingual students led to their increased involvement in the schools. Newsletters, conferences and meetings, translated into their native languages, and personal contacts by the resource teachers and/or IAs helped to bridge the gap between home and school. Staff and curriculum development both took place as well. Project staff attended workshops and courses to improve their skills, and, in order to help the teachers in their schools better understand and serve the LEP students in their classes, presented multicultural workshops at the project schools. Materials were purchased to fit students' needs or were translated and adapted by resource teachers. Overall, it would seem that the goal of better serving target students through the development of instructional programs encompassing curricula from both regular and bilingual programs in a coordinated and supportive structure was met.

Results of the outcome evaluation, which tested the hypothesis that effective coordination and development of instructional programs for LEP students would lead to improved student achievement in the three target instructional areas were less positive. Students who participated in the Bilingual Resource Service Model program showed improved achievement only in the area of mathematics; they did not meet the standards adopted for demonstrating improvement in reading and language achievement. The first, criterion-referenced, standard hypothesized that 75% of the students in project schools would show an increase in CAT scores in the targeted areas. In fact, student achievement scores show that project students met this level of score increase only in the area of math concepts/applications. While the increases in other areas were close, they did not reach the standard of 75% which had been arbitrarily set.

The second evaluation standard hypothesized that there would be a greater percentage of project than of control students who would show an increase in CAT scores in the targeted areas. This was confirmed only for the subtests of math computation and math concepts/applications. While the percentage of students showing gains on the language expression subtest was slightly higher for project schools over control schools, there was not a statistically significant difference. The percentage showing gains in reading comprehension was actually slightly higher for control than for project schools (although the difference was not statistically significant).

The final evaluation standard hypothesized that the average gain (in scaled score points) would be greater for project over control students in all three areas. Again, this was confirmed only in the area of math computation at a level of statistical significance. For both math concepts/applications and language expression subtests, project students did show an average increase in scaled scores greater than that of control students but differences were not significant. For reading comprehension, the control students showed a greater average gain in scaled scores but the difference was also not significant.

The results of the final two years of this project indicate that it was successful in raising student achievement (as measured by the CAT) only in the area of mathematics. Several possible reasons for such results will be explored. Perhaps the most important challenge to these results comes from the fact that the CAT has been inconsistently/inappropriately administered to bilingual

students in this District. In the past it has been the policy to administer grade level tests to all students regardless of where individual students might be functioning; e.g., a fifth grade student was administered the 5th grade level test even though she/he might be functioning at only 3rd or 4th grade level in English. Although this was the recommended policy, it was not always followed. Scores available for analysis for this report did not reflect this possibility so it is difficult to know exactly what was being measured by the CAT. Furthermore, testing Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at their grade level is of questionable validity in and of itself. A more appropriate practice, recommended for future studies, would be to give all students the locator test to determine at what level they should be tested and then administer the appropriate level CAT tests.

In a similar light, the analyses presented here used pooled data for both regular ESL and newcomer students. While the Chi-Square analysis of project and control group variables did not show a significant difference between these groups in terms of regular/newcomer status, it may be that the project had a greater effect on one or the other of these groups; such effect could not be separated out from the data available. Further, it is important to keep in mind that the assignment of status changes over time and does not accurately reflect how much schooling a student has had or missed in previous years. For example a 6th grade student newly arrived from Vietnam with five previous years of schooling would be considered a regular student as would a 6th grade student who had spent a year in the newcomer center after arriving a year ago with no previous schooling. Newcomer students in the project schools spent nearly twice as much time in the Bilingual Center as did regular students; what effect this had on their CAT performances cannot be determined.

The need to eliminate the Chinese population from the study brings up questions regarding the generalizability of results.

A further measure of the success of the program can be seen in the degree to which the program is missed now that it is no longer functioning. All of the resource teachers anticipated that both mainstream and bilingual teachers would feel the loss of the program. In fact, these resource teachers met during the school year following the close of the program to discuss results and follow-up. All but one of these teachers are still working in their respective schools, all with full-time teaching responsibilities. Comments from all of them indicated that they are still being asked to perform many of the duties of the past, that other teachers still look to them as a resource person and depend on their expertise. This implies that other teachers in all of the project schools value the role filled by the resource teacher and still feel the need for a high level of coordination between the regular and bilingual programs. All of the resource teachers concurred that the level of coordination is less now that there is not any one person to facilitate and encourage the needed communication.

While this report is an evaluation of only the final two years of the project's functioning, it also serves as the concluding report of the project's five year history. Overall, the success of the project can be seen in the improved level of curriculum coordination, communication and multicultural understanding in each of the project schools.

V. REFERENCES

Eisner, E.W. (1985). The art of educational evaluation: A personal view. Philadelphia, PA. Farmer Press, p. 2.

Kenny, David A. (1975). A quasi-experimental approach to assessing treatment effects in the nonequivalent control group design. Psychological Bulletin, 82, (3), 345-362.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

PROJECT SCHOOL	BILINGUAL PROGRAM DESIGN
ADAMS K-6	In order to encourage the integration of bilingual students into the mainstream and to improve the overall reading instructional program, an all school reading block was used. Bilingual students receive instruction within established group levels. they are pulled out only if they read below the lowest group level.
COE K-6	The bilingual program is coordinated with PE, music, and math. Students are pulled out during spelling, social studies, and language arts.
GREENWOOD K-6	Students are not pulled from their classes during reading. Instructional assistants work within the bilingual center.
KIMBALL K-6	Primary students are pulled out of regular classes during reading. Intermediate students have reading in their regular classroom and are pulled out during social studies/science.
WEST WOODLAND K-6	Instructional assistants provide instructional support in the regular classroom for grades K-2. These students are not pulled out at all. Students in grades 3-6 receive pull-out service in the bilingual center.
CONTROL SCHOOL	**BILINGUAL PROGRAM DESIGN**
ALKI	Students are served in a combined 80-82 program to maximize flexibility of staff. Students are not pulled from science, PE, music or art.
BAGLEY	The bilingual program coordinates with reading, PE, music, and speech therapy. The bilingual center teacher tries to meet with mainstream staff on a weekly basis to discuss coordination of student learning objectives.
GATEWOOD	The bilingual center staff coordinate LEP students' pullout with mainstream classroom teachers based on individual student needs.
LAFAYETTE	Students are pulled out to receive ESL and native language support. The program is coordinated with the Chapter I reading program.
LATONA	Students are pulled by grade level, by classroom. Pullout is coordinated so as not to conflict with PE. Newcomer students receive ESL and reading instruction in the center and regular students receive ESL. Both groups receive native language support in math and other content areas.
LOWELL	Pullout is coordinated with all school reading block. Instructional assistants work in the regular classrooms.
NORTH BEACH	Students are served by grade level. Instructional assistants work in the center. Science and social studies are coordinated for grades 406. The 3rd-6th graders participate in the reading block with mainstream students. There are also two groups taught by bilingual teachers for students who read below established group levels.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Adams Elementary serves students in grades K-6. As of May 1988, the bilingual program at Adams served 68 bilingual students including 37 newcomer students and 31 regular bilingual students. Among these students are 8 Laotian, Hmong Mien, 31 Cambodian, 20 Cham-Vietnamese, 2 Vietnamese, and 7 students speaking other languages. Newcomers, those who had never been to school before and/or had missed a significant amount of schooling because of war or refugee camp experience, spend 2½ hours a day in the bilingual center. The instructional focus was on oral communication and on building competence and fluency to communicate with teachers and other students in English. Written English was presented through a language experience approach relating to shared experiences.

Regular ESL students speak varying degrees of English but have had normal schooling in their own countries or have been here two or more years and have progressed in English and basic skills. They were served in the bilingual center for an hour each day. Instruction included ESL, reading, math, and language arts.

Teaching staff included the bilingual resource teacher who was also a half-time ESL teacher and three instructional assistants. All bilingual staff were involved in native language tutoring in math, science, social studies, and health as well as counseling, translations, home visits, etc. Parent training and close home-school communication was emphasized and the school newsletter was translated for parents.

Coe Elementary has one of the largest bilingual programs in the District with 113 LEP students. They come from Lao/Hmong/Mien, Chinese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Spanish-speaking backgrounds. Fifty-three of the target students were newcomers and 28 were regular ESL students. The staff in the bilingual center included three full-time and one half-time ESL teachers, one full-time Laotian IA, one half-time Chinese IA, and Filipino, Vietnamese, and Spanish-speaking tutors. Staff were involved in tutoring, parent training, selection of materials, and staff-development as well as translating and communicating with parents.

Greenwood Elementary is a K-6 school with a total bilingual population of 146 students, both newcomer and regular ESL students. The target population included 128 students of whom 65 were newcomers and 63 were regular ESL students. Newcomer students spend one-half of each day in the bilingual center with an instructional focus on basic skills including ESL, reading, and math. Instructional assistants also provided native language help for other subjects. Regular ESL students spent one hour/daily in the bilingual center with emphasis on ESL competency.

Staff included the ESL/resource teacher and four IAs who were involved in parent training, staff development, and much translation for parents. Because of the latter, many parents participated in school activities such as field trips and multicultural performances. The major language groups served at Greenwood are Lao/Hmong/Mien, Cambodian, and Vietnamese.

Kimball Elementary is a team teaching and open-concept school serving grades K-6. The bilingual center has an enrollment of approximately 100 children of whom 47 were target students. The resource teacher and IAs served students in Vietnamese and Chinese in addition to teaching ESL. Emphasis was on getting students involved in school activities and having them be a part of the mainstream. All but two students from 4-6 grades attended outdoor eduction camp. Parents were also targeted for inclusion in the school's programs. Newsletters were translated and phone calls achieved a 100% attendance at parent-teacher conferences. Parents also were active at the school cooking, translating and helping to make Kimball a truly multiethnic/multicultural school.

West Woodland Elementary serves K-6 students and had 31 students of the target populations enrolled.

The West Woodland bilingual program consisted of two unique components. The first involved service to first and second graders. These students received ESL instruction and native language subject matter support within their mainstream classroom. Classroom teachers arranged their daily schedules to provide students with 45 minutes of ESL instruction and 30 minutes of native language subject matter instruction from bilingual IAs. The physical arrangement of a non-pullout program reinforced team teaching and curriculum planning among both IAs, and ESL and mainstream classroom teachers.

The second component provided half-day service to grades 3-6 in the bilingual center. Students received instruction in ESL, reading, language arts, social studies, and math. During the half-day students were in the mainstream classrooms, the IAs served them there. This schedule provided students with native language instruction which paralleled regular classroom activities.

Emphasis was also given to serving the affective needs of the students with parent contacts, individual counseling, and peer-tutoring available. The resource teacher organized the Rainbow Festival, a multicultural multi-arts program that involved the entire school and parents.

APPENDIX C

Kim Van Luu, Resource Teacher
Greenwood Elementary School
June 14, 1988

REPORT SUMMARY, GREENWOOD CENTER

This report proposes to look at the beneficial effects of the Title VII Project on the the school, students, teacher and parents, and some recommendations as the Project terminates.

I. Highlights of the effects of Title VII Project on:

1. School

Greenwood school was so glad to have bilingual students to meet the required balance of minority students. The VII Project brought in money, and a half-time resourse teacher.

2. Students

Thanks to many workshops and presentation of multicultural performances, the majority students get to know the bilingual students who are proud to share their culture. This helps to build up a positive self image. Bilingual students see that there are teachers who speak their language; they have a sense of identity, of support and security. They accept themselves and do not wish they had been born white, like others. The learning process is improving. Besides, they are provided guidance, counseling and discipline that encourage development of desirable conduct and achievement. Older students get intensive help so that they will be alble to make grade adjustment from elementary to middle school.

3. Teachers

Teachers received information and resources to better understnd the learning styles of bilingual students, their habits, their behavior.

Understanding opens many doors to acceptance, thus the teaching process is improving for the better. The more you know what to teach, who you teach, the more effective you become.

4. Parents

Bilingual parents feel more secure to call and come to school because there are teachers who speak their language and who understand what they are experiencing (living in a new country). They are confident that the resource teacher will try to prevent their child from unnecessarily repeating a grade, or being sent to special Ed., not because of learning disabilities, but because of lack of language proficiency. We are lucky to have a school psychologist who has experience working with bilingual students.

II. Some recommendations As Title VII Projects terminates.

Good results depend on cooperation of principal, teachers and staff. The resource teacher can't do it all by herself. The routine has been set. The scheduling, curriculum, effective learning activities have been implemented. The concept of Title VII can be carried on. I would like to see the bilingual parents get more involved in the decision making of their children's education. For this to happen, the Bilingual instructional assistants need to serve as a bridge between school and home. They need to participate more in school activities both in the area of curriculum and extra-curriculum.

1. Parent Training

At the beginning of school year, sent home to parents:

a. Translation of rules and regulations of school.

b. Information sheets regarding: Immunization, homework, hygiene and clothing, illness, absences, head lice, Fire safty at home.

c. Explain the purpose of -- Open House (Oct. 27, 87)
Arts and Craft Fair (Nov.14, 87)
Parent/Teachers Conference (Nov.16,87)
School Carnival (April 9, 88)
Science Fair (May 19, 88)

d. All kinds of Field Trips throughout the year.

We're lucky to have 4 Full-time IA's to help communicate with parents in their native languages. The results were that we got bilingual parents to serve as chaperones for field trips. Parents came in to help in multicultural performances.

e. Explain to newcomer parents to avoid using physical force to discipline their children. They couldn't believe that their child might be taken away if there were proof of physical abuse.

2. Staff Development

a. Train instructional assistant on how to use the "Science Resource Book" that I developed during the summer, how to use Mecc Software for drills and practices in Math.

b. Brief new instructional assistant and tutors bout practices, rules and regulations of school.

3. Workshops attended

a. District in-service workshop at Whitman. Sept.2,3/87, 12 hours.

b. Multicultural resources at TRC, Marshall, Jan.12/88, 1 hour.

c. Child Abuse at Greenwood, Jan.13/88, 1.30 hour.

d. Arts workshop for teachers at Greenwood, Jan.20/88, 1 hour.

e. AIDS at Greenwood, May 3/88, 2 hours.

f. Minority Leadership workshop at Red Lion SeaTac, April 18/88, all day.

4. Non-Credit classes attended

a. PageMaker, Mcintosh, UW, April 6,-14/88, 8 hours.

b. Lotus 1 2 3, UW, June 21-28/88 9 hours.

5. Curriculum Development Materials

a. "Science Resource Book" is a useful book because we can't use regular science books which are too difficult for our students. The concepts are in simplified English with worksheets to reinforce the knowledge of concepts.

b. The purchase of Teacher's Edition of "Language for Meaning" (Houghton Mifflin) and "Growth in Spelling" (Laidlaw), used in mainstream classrooms, were of tremendous help to bilingual center teachers to explain quickly to students their assignments.

c. Multicultural books help mainstream teachers to know some of their bilingual students customs, habits, learning styles . . .

d. Scholastic Books

- Sprint Reading Skills Program designed for students who read 2 or 3 years behind grade level but the material was of students maturity levels. (Intermediate grades).

- Vocabulary Skills programs and L.A. Phonics are what we need for primary grades. These books are inexpensive compared with the Ginn books.

6. Coordination

a. Make sure that all bilingual students in the building eligible for help are served. Many bilingual students in the neighborhood register at school and the school secretary and regular classroom teachers sometimes are not aware of their eligibility for bilingual help.

b. LAS testing.

c. Scheduling ESL pull out, IA's and tutors. This required a lot of organization to be able to accomodate all classrooms.

d. Curriculum match between bilingual and mainstream classroom.

e. Liaison between bilingual center, regular classroooms, parents, Transitional Bilingual Education.

f. Conferences with teachers, school psychologist, principal, parents.

g. Guidance and counseling regarding discipline, undesirable behavior.

h. Sensitized teachers to bilingual students' needs.

i. Multicultural activities.

j. Supplemental curricula actiivities: special science projects, computer use, ESL materials.

Dolores Dong
Kimball Elementary School

PARENT TRAINING

We have definitely made much progress in parent contact and training at Kimball this year. It took much united effort from the mainstream classroom teachers as well as the bilingual center staff.

Previously, when we've scheduled training meetings for parents, 10-12 parents were in attendance. This year we decided to schedule mini sessions of 20 minutes around Parent-Conferences.

Two weeks prior to Parent-Teacher Conferences, bilingual staff made phone contacts with home to schedule the times bilingual parents can come to school for conferences. Then we tried to group as many as possible between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. and around 3-4 p.m. We requested the first group to come earlier by 20 minutes and the late group to stay later. We scheduled to meet with them two sessions each day for the week and one night sessions. We met with bilingual parents of Kindergartners separately in the mornings. All bilingual center staff participated: teachers, I.A.s and tutors.

Agenda included:

1. Kimball Philosophy - Rights and responsibilities of Kimball students
2. Explanation of Grades - report card, LAS, CAT(stanine)
3. Information about Vision Screening, Hearing, Dental checks, drug education, sex education
4. Concerns and expectations of each Team (Grade Level)
5. Building Parents' self esteem

We were able to meet with 100% of the bilingual parents.

NEWSLETTER

Kimball PTA, noting the lack of bilingual parents participation in decision making at the school, wanted to get more involvement from them. The Bilingual Enrichment Committee was formed to get some survey and input. In the surveys bilingual parents expressed they would like to receive school news translated into the ir native languages. The committee thought this was a good beginning: to communicate school information. Kimball PTA and Title VII funded the project. At the end of each month, the principal and resource teacher met to summarize and edit important announcements that month. Future events were highlighted. I.A. s and tutors translated. The parents ran the copies, collated, labeled each student's name on newsletter and sent home by counseling teacher. Newletters were translated into four languages.

Parents (con't)

As a result: More parents were involved with field trips. Bilingual parents came to school and helped with cooking projects during Lunar New Year celebrations. A few came to give workshops on caligraphy, herbal medicine. Grades 4-6 attended camp together this year. All but two bilingual students in those grades attended. Bilingual parents sponsored a food fair where they raised over $250 to defray the cost of the translated newsletters.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Language and Literacy Development for LEP Students (five all day sessions) Examined the recent researches in language acquisition implications and applications of these into our teaching methods. I had to perform a micro-teach.
2. Problem Solving Math Workshop (10 hours, three sessions in the evening)
3. Computer Workshop (24 hours, two hours after school each day)
4. Learning Styles (afternoon session)
5. Puget Sound Writing Workshop (five sessions, Wednesdays after school 3:30-5:30)
6. Handwriting Workshop (two half hour sessions before school)
7. Geography , using maps and globes (one two-hours session, after school)
8. Dr. Harry K. Wong : How You Can Be a Superb Successful Teacher (one Saturday)
9. Dr. Samuel Betances : Place of Equity In Our Quest of Excellence in American Education.(one Saturday)
10. Asian Studies Institute (Four weeks daily at University of Washington this summer)

COORDINATION

1. I have made much better use of our I.A's and tutors as resources to help with coordination. Since they are in direct contact with the students, I have requested that they communicate and work closer with the classroom teachers , as well as teachers at the bilingual center. I supervise the instruction and the planning of materials for the tutors and confer with the classroom teachers at least weekly. Similar objectives were taught.
2. Stronger advocacy for bilingual students. I am able to evaluate the needs of the students more efficiently because of the fewer number of students within each class and more time, I call attention to the problems to the classroom teachers.
3. LRC - Worked with LRC specialist to identify books meaningful to our students as well as visual materials. He ordered these materials.
4. Worked with PTA to form Bilingual Enrichment committee which coordinated Newsletters .
5. Administration - Met with Principal each week to review progress and problems relating to bilingual students.
6. Encouraged students in mainstream activities:
   a. Spelling Bee
   b. Young Writers Conference _ Some of our students wrote stories bilingually
   c. Outdoor Education Camp - borrowed sleeping bags, equipments
   d. Selling Raffle tickets _ each student must try to sell two
   e. Lunar New Year Assemby - Bilingual students teaching other students to paper cut, dance, Kung Fu and Lion Dance
7. Parent Training
8. Conflict Resolution with bilingual students and cultural understanding with teachers.
9. Worked with nurse in health education of students
10. Lunar New Year Staff Breakfast - Involved every staff person at Kimball. Invited 20 dignitaries to visit Kimball School, These included Superintendent Kendrick, Deputy Superintendent Art Binnie, School administrators, Managers of warehouse, transportation, PIPE partners and PTA officers.

SUMMATION

From the previous narratives, the role and responsibilities I've assumed as half time resource teacher at Kimball has to emerge. I felt I was a catalyst for positive reaction to occur between bilingual students, their parents (home) and the American School.

Except for the Kindergartners who attend only in the mornings when I have teaching duties, I felt I knew each individual student in the bilingual program well. I have personalized much of their instructional program these five years of Title VII Basic Project. Acquiring learning skills has been much more focused for them and goals defined. The students have grown academically, as well as in positive self esteem and confidence. These are demonstrated in their involvement with mainstream learning activities. Except for two students, every bilingual student in grades 4-6 attended outdoor education for three days. This did not evolve easily , but with much coaxing of students and parents by staff. Negative behaviors were dealt with immediately and influencially, such as stealing and truancy. I have gone to student's home to retrieve stolen items. Truancy were dealt with seriously between school and home. These did not occur again. To have a teacher available for counseling, for questions and answers I felt was beneficial and important for these LEP students. They were accepted readily into mainstream also. The PTA funded our program field trips just like any other teams.

Each school is different. I felt we were given freedom and professional trust by the TitleVII supervisor to meet the needs and responsibilities of each school with the individual styles and strengths of each resource teacher.

With the availability of a resource teacher, parents of bilingual students also gained more confidence for involvement in the school, as exemplified by 100% attendance at Parent-Teacher conferences. It is exciting to see multi- language translations around the school. The Kimball Philosophy was translated in four languages.

Teachers really made use of the materials resources through Title VII. We purchased and shared the newest National Geographic visual materials, computer software for the LRC. Individualized and hands on instructional materials were purchased for the use of bilingual students in the classroom. Funds were utilized to promote the multi-ethnicity of our students through art work, cooking of foods . Resources of dictionaries were helpful for translations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summation (con't)

Funding of summer school was a major positive force for students whose home language is not English. Summer months seem a long stretch to forget skills. I am concerned this summer that students will not receive instructions.

With the conclusion of this project, the half time resource teacher will not be there next year at Kimball School. The staff have been assigned more students and less help. That need will be felt. The mainstream staff at KImball have come to be dependent on bilingual center for problem solving and all home contacts. They will have to take up the major responsibilities. Kimball teachers will remain sensitive to the needs of bilingual students. Whether these needs can be met wholly in their heavy schedule will be a concern.

Human resources provided by the Title VII project were the most valuable: capable supervisor, resource teachers and instructional assistants. They provided home education as well as school education. To have excellence in education, we need that support from the students' homes.

Each year as I grow in skills and confidence, I have been the motivator and energizer for the staff at Kimball in regard to LEP students. Our bilingual program has high visibility. The students and staff at the bilingual center also contribute to the multiethnic/multicultural education that we all so desired for schools in the twenty-first century.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dan Vu
Adams School
June 29, 1989

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

I made a presentation to the staff about the bilingual program at Adams and also talked to staff on how to help the bilingual students to learn faster with a topic "Meaning Must Come First." I had very good feedback from the principal and staff.

As a member of the Multicultural Committee, I regularly had meetings with the principal and teachers to implement Multicultural Education in Adams School. I demonstrated and assisted teachers in many cultural activities and also provided many different cultures material to Adams staff.

Attached is a whole school project that I developed during Lunar New Year's Day. All teachers and students participated this project and appreciated our different cultures. Another whole school activity is a big photograph wall mural in the main hallway:

COORDINATION

The ten most important coordination activities:

1. Curriculum
2. Cultural Activities in the school
3. Scheduling IA's and Tutors
4. Liaison
5. Scheduling of bilingual classes
6. Parent involvement
7. Materials
8. Assessment
9. Supplemental Curriculum
10. Teacher training

Dan Vu
Adams School
June 29, 1989

PARENTING TRAINING

These are activities at Adams School in which the resource teacher and bilingual staff work directly with bilingual parents:

- Coordinate all the activities between school, bilingual parents and bilingual students.
- Help bilingual parents to understand and become involved in many different important activities at school.
- Translate into different languages all the letters sent home to bilingual parents.
- Arrange buses for bilingual parents and bilingual students for open house evenings, Parent-Teacher Conferences and Multicultural night.
- Introduce bilingual staff to bilingual parents; discuss all concerns about the bilingual program at Adams School. How does the staff work with bilingual students? How can bilingual staff and bilingual parents work closely together?
- Send letters to bilingual parents with suggestions about homework, sleep, illness, doctor, dentist and clothes.
- Coordinate the Parent-Teacher Conference schedule.
- Conference with parents and classroom staff about bilingual students, school work, promotion and non-promotion, exit criteria, discipline and grading policies.
- Help parents to correct birthdate and adjust grade level for bilingual students.
- Work with school nurse, Department of Health and Social Services to make sure the students with health problems are taken care of by the doctor.
- Discuss with bilingual parents about outdoor educational camp, field trips.
- Discuss with bilingual parents about different cultures, different holidays in the U.S.A. (Halloween, Christmas, Valentine and Lunar New Year).

Dan Vu, Resource Teacher
Adams School
June 29, 1988

FIVE YEAR SUMMATION OF THE PROGRAM

The Title VII project started late in 1983 but has improved quickly in the past 5 years. The resource teacher and all Adams staff workws together to provide a variety of coordination activities and an instructional plan for each student. Title VII worked for the whole staff, parents and students to provide better communication, better instructional programs and more understanding between different cultures in school.

When the project is terminated next year, the teachers will have to do many non instructional activities at home or during class time and they will not have time to coordinate the instructional plan regularly with the other teachers to meet the need of the bilingual students. The teachers will have less time to teach and may not know what the students learn in the other classes.

In order to continue to benefit the bilingual students, the main goals of bilingual program at Adams still have to continue to be:

- Develop in students a sense of pride in their own cultural heritage, as well as respect for other cultures.

- Bilingual staff, the principal and all mainstream teachers must work together to implement multicultural education in Adams school and, if possible, involve all of the parents.

- Assist students to gain proficiency in English, Reading, Math and other subject matter in order to mainstream effectively.

- Coordinate with the general school programs in order to avoid a "school within a school." The classroom staff can not just rely on bilingual staff to teach the bilingual students but they also need to design lesson/programs that meets the needs of every student in every subject.

Bl.319(36)

Coe Elementary Resource Teacher

Mary Chenn

Re: Title VII Project Wrap Up

Parent Training

We held a parent training meeting on October 7, 1987 before our Open House night. The following topics were covered:

a. Bilingual Program vs. Compensatory Education Program
b. Parents/Teachers Conference
c. Homework
d. Report Cards
e. PTA-sponsored activities: Carnival, Gym Night, International Night

The meeting was a big success, and the seventeen families who attended showed their support by participating in PTA activities later that year.

On February 10, 1988, another small parent training meeting was called concerning possible candidates for the Special Education program. Jan Sherwood, our school psychologist, was present to explain the identification and assessment procedures. Since the families who attended were Laos, Chinese, and Filipino, the bilingual team translated Mrs. Sherwood's instructions for them. Three students' families attended, and all three will be placed in Special Ed next year.

Staff Development

Courses taken and workshops attended:

--attended the WAESOL Conference on October 16 and 17, 1987
--completed a District's in-service workshop titled "Multicultural and Equity Education: Students in Gender Expectations and Student Achievement (GESA)" from October, 1987 to March, 1988
--completed a 5-day session workshop titled "Northwest Language Development Specialist Academy" from November, 1987 to May, 1988
--attended the "Leadership for Equity and Excellence Seminar: The Place of Equity in Our Quest for Excellence in American Education" on May 14, 1988

Staff Training:

On March 23, the bilingual team presented a training session for the building staff. The topics covered were:

a. helping LEP students in the classroom
b. cultural awareness
c. the role of the bilingual center

Followed by a question-answer period, the session was a big success.

In addition, I often provide handouts of current research findings and classroom applications/observations of language development. These are well received by the staff.

Curriculum Development

Materials purchased are carefully selected by bilingual staff and classroom teachers based on the special needs of students. Our goal is to correspond as closely as possible the developmental level of the students to the supplement materials selected. We analyze the needs of both regular and newcomer students to utilize district curriculum, teach with the same objectives, and modify the istructional levels to meet each individual's needs. The bilingual staff works closely with classroom teachers, aides, tutors, and volunteers to provide extra help for LEP students.

Materials

A few examples of the types of materials purchased are:

Ginn Reader (Level Two)
The bilingual staff participates in an all-school reading program; we are using more low-level basal readers for our students.

Open Sesame Picture Dictionary
Over 550 vocabulary words are introduced in situations familiar to ESL students. The format encourages reinforcement of the vocabulary as students can recognize items both in context and in individual illustrations. Each newcomer keeps one dictionary to use in the classroom, and he/she gradually builds up his/her own word bank.

Math Skills/Problem Solving
The purpose is to help students master basic facts, increase speed and accuracy, and build confidence in math computation. The books contain hands-on activities and practiced applications involving money and time. Many students find difficulty on reading a problem, identifying a graphic situation, interpreting data, and choosing the appropriate operations. They need additional practice in math vocabulary and basic problem-solving strategies.

Language Skills/Social Studies/Science Readers
They provide:
- --basic oral language development
- --phonics and sight words
- --comprehension exercises
- --reading enjoyment
- --map-reading skills
- --reinforcement of new concepts
- --study of related materials
- --hands-on experiences and discoveries
- --various scientific concepts

Puzzles and Games

To motivate skill-building, oral language, and concept development, a variety of reading and math activities are implemented. They are a viable (and enjoyable) method of achieving many educational objectives.

Inventory

(please see attached papers)

Coordination

The twelve most important activities for which I was responsible at Coe school were:

1. to coordinate instructional programs for bilingual students, encompassing curriculum from both regular and bilingual programs.

2. to maintain close contact with classroom teachers and discuss each student's progress. I suggested appropriate instructional materials for their needs.

3. to serve as a communication "link" between schools and the homes of bilingual students. I made phone contact, translated home bulletins, and provided interpretation as necessary to keep the bilingual families well informed.

4. to conduct parent training sessions and keep them up-to-date on the current happenings at Coe.

5. to serve on the Child Study Team. There, I conferred, interpreted, and made recommendations to parents, concerning possible student referrals for Sp. Ed and Speech Therapy programs.
6. to provide guidance and counsel to bilingual students whenever situations such as conflicts or behavioral problems occured.

7. to set up schedules of instruction for the bilingual center, avoiding conflict with the regular classroom and PE/music schedules.

8. to assist two instructional assistants, three tutors, and parent volunteers in scheduling, planning, and sharing teaching methods.

9. to conduct classroom presentations of multicultural activities to promote awareness and understanding of other ethnic cultures. (primarily Chinese, Lao, and Vietnamese)

10. to coordinate "Chinese New Year's Celebration" and "International Night" with the PTA to display exhibitions and performances.

11. to plan field trips to:
--Ming Exhibit (Seattle Art Museum)
--Chinasaurs: The Dinosaurs of Sichuan (Burke Museum)
--Ferry ride to Bainbridge Island

12. to correspond with Coe's sister school in Chongqing, China. I also have translated students' pen-pal letters from English to Chinese and vice versa.

Summation of the Program

Coe Elementary has one of the biggest and best bilingual programs in the District. The enrollment of 110 limited English Proficiency students includes backgrounds where native languages are Lao/Hmong/Mien, Chinese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Spanish. The staff in the bilingual center consists of three full-time and one half-time ESL teacher, two of whom are also Chinese bilingual teachers. There is one full-time Laotion Instructional Assistant and one half-time Chinese Instructional Assistant. There are also Filipino, Vietnamese, and Spanish tutors.

Coe is one of five schools under Title VII ESEA Bilingual Resource Service Model Project. Title VII funding provides a half-time Resource Teacher and a half-time bilingual Chinese Instructional Assistant. All bilingual students have benefited from the services provided by this project, but those students whose academic progress will be measured for evaluation are those who speak Lao/Hmong/Mien and Chinese.

My responsibilities are to coordinate and develop instructional programs for LEP students, encompassing curriculum from both regular classrooms and the bilingual center. During my 1½ year service, I have established a better system of communication with the regular staff. Twice a year, I met with each teacher and checked units or SLO on Curriculum Match Sheets. We, the ESL/Bilingual teachers, used these as guidelines to reinforce some, if not all, of the checked SLOs.

At the same time, supplement instructional materials were selected and adapted; these provided support in curriculum coordination and development. Whenever a new bilingual student arrived, I gave individual help and care to make him/her more comfortable in the new environment. I assigned "bilingual student buddies" to make studying more easier as well as more enjoyable. Then I tested the new student's oral proficiency and reading level in order to place him/her in the appropriate ESL/reading classes. The classroom teachers can always depend on the resource teacher to place the students in the correct level of instruction.

I also served as a communication liaison for the school and the parents of student who did not speak English. I frequently made home contacts and translated parent bulletins to keep the families up-to-

date with the current happenings at Coe. I encouraged parents to participate in PTA-sponsored activities, and I was always present at the events to welcome the families and assist in interpreting.

I developed multicultural activities and located resource materials that promoted cross-cultural understanding and appreciation. I was also invited to conduct classroom multicultural presentations (primarily Chinese. Lao, and Vietnamese). Materials were also available for regular classroom teachers to use as well. I provided guidance and counsel to bilingual students whenever needs arose.

Overall, the staff was very appreciative and supportive of the Resource Teacher program. When the first draft of "Kendrick's Plan" was introduced, it was announced the bilingual program was to be relocated at Lawton School. The parents demonstrated their support to keep the program at Coe by meeting with School Board Representative, Elizabeth Wales. There, the parents stressed the importance of its continuation at Coe by reiterating the many successes of the past. The final draft stated the program was to remain at Coe.

Without the Resource Teacher, it is apparent the program will suffer and will not be as entirely efficient. To remedy this, the faculty and bilingual center must devise an adequate system of communication among themselves. Since this is usually the Resource Teacher's job, the staff must, on its own time, comprise a way to coordinate its curriculum.

Ultimately, a good system of communication directly affects the student's learning process. Vital information must be relayed from the classrooms to the homes in order to keep parents well informed. Hopefully, the bilingual team will sustain its creditable reputation in the promotion of student learning.

Nancy Steers - Resource Teacher - West Woodland

June 14, 1988

Title VII Project Wrap Up

Parent Training

1. Fall Conferences

A Bilingual Evening was scheduled, Nov. 17, 1987, from 5-7:30, for parents of bilingual students. This provided themt eh opportunity to:

a. Meet staff - both teachers and I.A.s
b. Conference with teachers (mainstream and bilingual)
c. Take a school tour
d. Meet other parents, especially from their own language group which established a level of comfortability
e. Meet the resource teacher
f. Receive general information on school, parent and student responsibilities Phone numbers were provided in case of any other questions that may of arise after the conference.

2. Individual Counseling

This counseling was done with parents of students of greatest need both at home and over the phone. In the case of limited English, parents were counselled by the I.A. with direct translation coming from the resource teacher. When English was not a barrier, the resource teacher could do the counseling. Subjects that were communicated as priority concerns were:

a. establishing a study time and place at home
b. to anticipate homework
c. to be aware of and take action on medical and dental needs
d. to be aware of retention concerns and possible special education placement

Staff Development

1. Peer Tutor Program

An inservice training was given to 5th and 6th grade teachers in which the objectives of the Peer Tutor Program were presented by the resouce teacher. In addition, The A+ Tutor, a handbook for tutors was given to each mainstream teacher so that they could become familiar with the content that would be later presented to the 5th and 6th grade peer tutors. The focus was on the need to meet individual needs of the bilingual student while in the mainstream classroom, particularly in the content area of reading and spelling.

2. CAT Test Preparation

An inservice training was given to all 1st - 6th grade teachers to give suggestions for activities and general content knowledge that would prepare their students for the CAT test. An emphasis was placed on the format of the test, to make it as familiar as possible to ease anxiety and increase performance. A special focus was made for the concerns of the bilingual student to anticipate some problems in the understanding of the instructions of the test.

3. Rainbow Festival

This is multi-cultural/multi-arts program that involves the entire school. The resource teacher is the coordinator of the production and is used as a resource for materials that are needed for presentations in the classroom and on stage. The commitment made by the mainstream teachers is to integrate their curriculum with the information and culture of a foreign country for a period of 6 weeks prior to the culminating event of a stage performance.

Coordination

1. Meetings scheduled with mainstream teachers to identify their needs of bilingual students.
2. Report card clarification of marks with bilingual staff to prevent mixed messages going home to students and parents from the bilingual center and mainstream classrm.
3. Established Lesson Plan Form to aid communication in specific reading assignments by bilingual staff to mainstream teacher.
4. Meetings with bilingual staff to discuss curriculum and lesson plans and how they matched ability level of students & mainstream activities.
5. Staffing meetings with counselor and psychologist to evaluate specail ed. students Placement for fall "88 a major objective we worked to meet to provide the best service so questions wouldn't be left open.
6. Scheduling of IA and tutor time in the building to best meet student & teacher needs.
7. Coordination of appropriate service in Intervention given as additional support for bilingual students.
8. Coordination of tutoring; Peer, High School and Parent Volunteer
9. Availabilty to all staff for concerns. Often it was easier to have problems articulated to a 3rd party rather than directly between mainstream/bilingual teacher or IA/teacher. I found this role to be widely used.
10. Rainbow Festival
11. Home/school liason for problems and concerns from school.
12. Ensure necessary district adopted material were available for bilingual staff and conducted "mini-methods sessions" with them to orient them to the new reading series.

The Title VII project has evolved from a monitoring system of checks and balances of classroom activities to an overall integral part of the school. The staff, for the most part, anticipate with pleasure the element of bilingual students in their classroom. Because my role has expanded to include many elements beyond what can be quantified on paper, the ease and acceptance of the bilingual program at West Woodland has continued to grow.

The positive aspects have been:

1. Providing materials for bilingual students not otherwise available due to their need of lower ability than grade placement.
2. Scheduling IA and tutor time to best meet needs of mainstream teachers.
3. Creating a system of reinforcement of objectives taught between mainstream and bilingual teachers.
4. To be someone staff could turn to to solve non-academic problems (health, home enviornment, etc.)
5. Coordinate the Rainbow Festival, a multi-cultrual event which provided an all school awareness of cultural differences that contribute to the richness of the students body at West Woodland. Over the 5 years it has evolved from a small stage presentation to a large stage production that is the culminating event of 6 weeks of study in each classroom of a country and its culture. This year it was attended by over 600 parents and friends.
6. To be a ready source for any translated messages to go home, in addition to report cards.
7. To make home contact when required legally for procedures. (Medical/dental Special Ed. permission forms)
8. To be someone the students could count on and knew was always there for them.
9. Establishing a Peer Tutor Program.

The negative aspect was dealing with staff who were unwilling to change their teaching style/curriculum to meet the needs of bilingual students in the mainstream classroom. Not being an administrative position, the accountability to me was minimal and consequently created some frustration.

Many of the positive elements will continue to benefit students at West Woodland due to the staff's commitment to teach all children. Some will see to it that the "basics" of common objectives being taught and home communication through IAs will continue. They will now have to be responsible to go one step further to initiate things so that over time, I can see the impact of the resource teacher position begin to shrink. Some mechanics are in place; (The A+Tutor Teacher's Edition

weekly report forms for reading lesson plans, translations of report cards) readily available for continunity. With a new pricipal coming in coupled with the loss of the resource teacher, it will very much return to individual teachers' efforts to maintain the level of output for the bilingual student. I feel I have been able to effectively integrate bilingual instruction into mainstream curriculum at a building level so it will remain an active component of teachers' lesson plans, though realizing it will vary among individual staff members.

The benefits to bilingual students served are many.

1. Individual lesson plans to meet a variety of ability levels regardless of grade placement, to ensure progress.
2. Comfort level at school increased knowing that staff was committed to their success.
3. Resource teacher was a person available for individual needs to aid in problems at school as well at home, a counselor role if needed.
4. The special services afforded to those in need (health concerns, special ed. placement that happened quickly and with care because the resource teacher had time beyond the boundaries of the classroom teacher. These type of services help so much in the mental stability/comfort level of students as their attitude about school positively effects their academic progress.
5. A countinunity for students through the years with a constant in the resource teacher even as other staff members change due to district staffing needs. This element made a difference in the role of home contact as well. The parents knew the resource teacher without reestablishing the relationship each year.
6. As teachers'styles/commitment vary from year to year that the student comes in contact with, the resource teacher provided a measuring stick to ensure the basics were presented at the appropriate level for the bilingual student.

Recommendations for the future to be aware of by the District are:

1. Involve Principal, Head Teacher and teachers (representing componants of a potential school site i.e. intermediate, primary, Intervention) to discuss reception of a Resource TEacher. It needs large staff support.
2. Determine time in the position by the number of mainstream teachers. 12 or less .5 FTE, more than 12 a 1.0 FTE.
3. Detail to the Dirtrict the benefits beyond what is quantifiable. Perhaps more in line with the role of a Head Teacher in terms of the job description, naturally with a bilingual focus and emphasis.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Seattle Public Schools

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Michael R. Preston, President
Kenneth H. Eastlack, Vice President
Amy Hagopian
Ellen Roe
Connie Sidles
Marilyn S. Smith
Alan Sugiyama

SUPERINTENDENT
William M. Kendrick

BEST COPY AVAILABLE